

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 11-16, 18-24, and 26-60 are pending in the application and stand rejected. Claims 1, 18, 29, 34, 43, 46, 53, 57 and 60 are amended in this paper. Applicants hereby respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims.

Claim Objections

Claims 18, 34 and 60 have been amended and are now believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw these objections.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-9, 11-16 and 46-52 have been provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting. The Applicants attorney will appropriately address this rejection at such time as the copending claims cited by the Examiner issue.

Rejection of Claims 1 and 4-9 Under 35 USC 102(b) As Being Anticipated By Lehman

Claim 1

Claim 1, as amended, recites a front-end circuit operable to receive a plurality of radio signals, transmitted across a frequency band, by utilizing a plurality of aviation-specific modulation formats and which correspond to a plurality of aviation-specific radio channels and aviation-specific functions, and operable to generate an analog signal simultaneously carrying a plurality of channels within said frequency band; an analog to digital converter operable to convert said analog signal to a digital signal simultaneously carrying said plurality of channels within said frequency band; and a digital processing system operable to receive said digital signal and substantially simultaneously generate a plurality of aviation-specific output signals corresponding to a plurality of channels within said frequency band.

In contrast, Lehman fails to teach or suggest the claimed limitations, particularly as they

pertain to aviation-specific modulation formats and functionality.

Claims 4-9

Claims 4-9 are patentable for at least the reason that they respectively depend from claim 1.

Rejection of Claims 1, 5-8, 11-16, 34-36, 38 and 43 Under 35 USC 102(e) or 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over Kaminski

Claim 1

As is the case with the Lehman reference, Kaminski fails to teach or suggest the claimed limitations, particularly as they pertain to aviation-specific modulation formats and functionality.

Claims 34 and 43

Claims 34 and 43 are patentable for at least reasons similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1.

Claims 5-8, 11-16, 35-36, and 38

Claims 5-8, 11-16, 35-36, and 38 are patentable for at least the reason that they respectively depend from claims 1, 34, and 43.

Rejection of Claims 2-3, 39-42, 44-45, 46-52, 53-54, 57 and 59 Under 35 USC 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over Kaminski In View of Phillips

Phillips fails to supply the teachings missing from Kaminski, particularly as they pertain to aviation-specific modulation formats and functionality. As such Kaminski and Phillips, taken either each alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the limitations of claims 1, 34, 43,

46, 53 and 57. Additionally, and consequently, claims 2-3, 39-42, 44-45, 47-52, 54 and 59 are patentable for at least the reason that they respectively depend from claims 1, 34, 43, 46, 53 and 57.

Rejection of Claims 60, 18-23, 26-27 Under 35 USC 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over Kaminski In View of Analog Devices Document

The Analog Devices Document fails to supply the teachings missing from Kaminski, particularly as they pertain to aviation-specific modulation formats and functionality. As such, Kaminski and the Analog Devices Document, taken either each alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the limitations of claims 1 and 18. Additionally, and consequently, claims 19-23, 26-27 and 60 are patentable for at least the reason that they respectively depend from claims 1 and 18.

Rejection of Claims 1-9, 11-16, 29-33, 34-42, 43-45, 46-52, 53-54 and 57-59 Under 35 USC 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over Phillips In View of Caldwell

Caldwell fails to supply the teachings missing from Phillips, particularly as they pertain to aviation-specific modulation formats and functionality. As such, Phillips and Caldwell, taken either each alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the limitations of claims 1, 29, 34, 43, 46, 53 and 57. Additionally, and consequently, claims 2-9, 11-16, 30-33, 35-42, 44-45, 47-52, 54 and 58-59 are patentable for at least the reason that they respectively depend from claims 1, 29, 34, 43, 46, 53 and 57.

Rejection of Claims 60, 18-24, and 26-28 Under 35 USC 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over Phillips In View of Caldwell and the Analog Devices Document

Caldwell and the Analog Devices Document fail to supply the teachings missing from Phillips, particularly as they pertain to aviation-specific modulation formats and functionality. As such, Phillips, the Analog Devices Document and Caldwell, taken either each alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the limitations of claims 1 and 18. Additionally, and consequently, claims 19-24, 26-28 and 60 are patentable for at least the reason that they respectively depend from claims 1 and 18.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims of the pending application are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendment, withdrawal of the rejections, allowance, and early passage through issuance. If the examiner has any questions, the examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' attorney listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM^{PLLC}

/P.G. Scott Born/

P.G. Scott Born
Registration No. 40,523
Direct Dial: 206.957.2491